

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of June 21, 2011 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 33 and 34 are new. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-27, and 32-34 are pending upon entry of the present paper. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21-23, 25, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 (“Davis”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,383 (“Fleischer”), U.S. Pat. No. 6,177,931 (“Alexander”), and U.S. Pat. No. 6,577,350 (“Proehl”).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, Alexander, and Proehl, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,018 (“Kudrolli”).

Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, Alexander, and Proehl, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,708 (“Witbrock”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, Alexander, and Proehl, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,543 (“Wehmeyer”).

These rejections are traversed below.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “wherein the transmitted abbreviated program title and the transmitted original program title are configured to be interchanged in a program title field of the electronic program guide at a first location.”

In rejecting claim 1 under section 103, the Office Action at page 6 concedes that Davis in view of Fleischer and Alexander fail to teach displaying an abbreviated program title *interchangeably* with an original program title in *a* program title field of an electronic program guide at *a* first location. The Office Action at page 6 contends that Proehl at col. 6, line 60 – col. 7, line 22 describes such features. Applicants disagree. Proehl at the cited passages merely describes that a zoom command may transition an electronic programming guide (EPG) from a

first level of detail to a second level of detail and that the different levels of detail may reflect additional stations shown or programming times, or both. Proehl at col. 7, lines 14-18 describes that if the second level of detail is greater than the first level of detail, the font size, the program title areas and the areas spanned by certain periods of time may be reduced to fit the additional information. Merely reflecting additional stations shown or programming times (the additional detail provided in Proehl in response to a zoom initiated by a user) fails to teach or suggest interchanging a (transmitted) abbreviated program title and a (transmitted) original program title, much less performing that alleged interchange in a program title field of an electronic program guide at a first location as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied art for at least the foregoing reasons (notwithstanding whether the alleged combination of documents would have been proper).

Moreover, Alexander at col. 15, lines 47-55 describes that titles are shortened for display in a grid guide mode of an EPG, and that the entire title is displayed in a detailed description area of the grid guide when a viewer highlights a tile in the grid guide for the corresponding program listing. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art, starting from Davis, Fleischer, and Alexander, would not have had a reason to include the alleged teaching of Proehl, as doing so would modify the principle of operation in Alexander – namely, the basis for displaying shortened or entire titles. MPEP 2143.01 (VI.) (the proposed modification cannot change the principle of operation of a reference). As the modification of Davis, Fleischer, and Alexander by Proehl is improper, claim 1 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Independent claims 9 and 17 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claims 9 and 17 are allowable for at least reasons substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as any of the additional documents (e.g., Kudrolli, Witbrock, or Wehmeyer) fail to remedy the deficiencies of Davis, Fleischer, Alexander, and Proehl described above (notwithstanding whether any of the combinations of documents used in the rejections of the dependent claims would have been proper).

The dependent claims are further distinguishable from the applied documents in view of the features recited therein. For example, claim 32 recites “wherein the transmitted abbreviated

program title and the transmitted original program title are configured to be interchanged in the program title field responsive to a zoom command.” Davis, Fleischer, Alexander, and Proehl, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-noted features recited in claim 32. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Proehl fails to describe that an abbreviated program title and an original program title are configured to be interchanged in a program title field. Instead, Proehl (at col. 6, line 60 – col. 7, line 22) merely describes showing additional stations and/or programming times in response to a zoom. As such, claim 32 is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least these additional reasons.

New Claim(s)

Claim 33 is illustratively supported by the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example at paragraph [0016] (describing that nonrelational adjectives may be deemed nonessential and removed, but that an exception may be made for adjectives of single noun sentences – for example, “The Big, Red House” might be left as “Red House” rather than simply “House.”).

Claim 34 is illustratively supported by the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example at paragraph [0018] (describing that the program title “The Joy of English Literature” may be abbreviated to “Joy/Eng Lit”).

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claim and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Appln. No.: 09/997,336
Office Action dated June 21, 2011
Response dated July 7, 2011

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: July 7, 2011

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/
Mark E. Wilinski
Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001